

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2017

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3619	
GEF Agency project ID		GCP/RAS/269/GFF	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO	
Project name		CTI Strategies for Fisheries Bycatch Management	
Country/Countries		Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		IW-1 Restoring and sustaining coastal and marine fish stocks and associated biological diversity	
Executing agencies involved		National fisheries authorities, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		As beneficiaries	
Private sector involvement		As beneficiaries	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		July 7, 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		April 1 st , 2012	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		October 31 st , 2015	
Actual date of project completion		December 31 st , 2016	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.2	0.2
	Co-financing	0.22	0.22
GEF Project Grant		3.0	3.2
Co-financing	IA own	0.3	1.15
	Government	2.11	2.64
	Other multi-/bi-laterals	3.72	0.31
	Private sector	2.06	1.13
	NGOs/CSOs	0.21	0.74
Total GEF funding		3.2	3.2
Total Co-financing		8.62	5.97
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		11.81	9.17
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		January 2017	
Author of TE		Graeme Macfadyen and Sherry Heileman	
TER completion date		4/30/2018	
TER prepared by		Molly Sohn	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	L
M&E Design		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	MS
M&E Implementation		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	MU
Quality of Implementation		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	MU
Quality of Execution		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	UA
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Project's Global Environment Objective is to promote "responsible trawl fisheries that result in sustainable fisheries resources and healthy marine ecosystems in the Coral Triangle and Southeast Asian waters by reduced bycatch, discards and fishing impact on biodiversity and the environment" (PRODOC p.iii)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objective is to achieve "effective public and private sector partnership for improved trawl and bycatch management and practices that support fishery dependent incomes and sustainable livelihoods." (Prodoc p.iii)

Project activities were organized under three components, as follows:

- 1) Policy, legal and institutional frameworks, which focused on the adoption of an agreed regional bycatch policy/strategy
- 2) Resource management and fishing operations, including measures and incentives to manage and reduce bycatch, and institutional arrangements for bycatch management
- 3) Information management and communication on bycatch and habitat indicators
- 4) Awareness and knowledge

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

This project is relevant to two of the objectives of the GEF International Waters Focal Area: To foster International, multi-state cooperation on priority transboundary water concerns, and to catalyze transboundary action addressing water concerns, as well as the IW Strategic Program 1: Restoring and Sustaining Coastal and Marine Fish Stocks by promoting regional and international cooperation on aquatic resources priority issues.

The project is also relevant to the priorities of the project countries. Three of the five project countries are part of the Coral Triangle Initiative, which is consistent with the project's objectives. The Coral Triangle Initiatives Regional Plan of Action Goal No 2: Ecosystem Approach to Management of Fisheries (EAFM) and Other Marine Resources Fully Applied is particularly consistent with the project. Regional initiatives including the APEC Bali Plan of Action and Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission (APFIC) initiatives cover all five project countries. Finally, the project supported development of national medium-term priority frameworks by FAO in the countries covered by this project.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	---------------------------------

Although project results varied both by country and across the project's four components, the project has been moderately satisfactory in achieving expected objectives.

The project's first component was focused on policy, legal and institutional frameworks. In four of the five countries, policy frameworks were reviewed and a report with recommendations was prepared. These reports were used to inform the ongoing management planning processes at sub-national levels, and – according to the TE – “contributed in some (probably small) way to national policy and legal developments that took place during the project.” The TE notes that the project helped to increase policy discussion at the regional level on bycatch reduction and management of trawl fisheries. Additionally, the project set up institutional arrangements for implementation of the Samar Sea Management Plan. In the Philippines, these arrangements were working well at the time of project completion, while in Thailand and Viet Nam they had been elaborated but were not yet functioning as plans had not been finally agreed upon. However, in these countries the project has established national working groups which were providing a framework for discussion and agreement about trawl fisheries bycatch management.

The project's second component was Resource management and fishing operations. The evaluation mission was not able to assess achievement of the first target under this component, that more

selective trawl gear and/or alternative fishing practices be used by at least half of the trawlers in project areas. Gear trials were completed in Thailand and Viet Nam to identify more selective gears, and national policy developments resulted in more selective practices in both countries. The project fully achieved the second target that selection criteria and recommendations for demarcating fishing zones and areas for spatial-temporal closures are identified in at least two project areas/countries, achieved the first part of the third target that an inventory of selected trawl fleets in project areas is drawn up, and recommendations for fishing effort and capacity management strategy is communicated to national authorities, and based on recommendations of the MTR ceased activities toward the fourth target, that an agreement be reached on appropriate incentive packages for all trawl fisheries in project areas.

The project's third component focused on Information management and communication. The four targets under this component were mostly met. The project supported partner countries in collecting and compiling baseline data on bycatch and discards, with both public and private sector stakeholders involved in the process. Socio economic surveys were conducted in the partner countries as well, although they were conducted too late to feed into the development of fisheries management plans during the project. To strengthen capacity for data collection and mapping, the project held national training workshops on data collection protocols and methodologies, including training on conducting socio-economic surveys and gender mainstreaming. A project website was set up to share information, however language barriers may have reduced the usefulness of the project website, which was in English. Project information, education, and communication material was produced, and all project countries planned to publish some of the national project reports.

The project's final component was focused on awareness and knowledge. The evaluation assesses that outputs under this component were achieved, though to varying degrees within the individual countries. This component focused aimed to improve fishers and other relevant stakeholders knowledge on bycatch, sustainability issues and collaborative management, to sensitize that regional and national policy and decisionmakers with regard to responsible trawl fisheries management through project information and workshops, and to improve knowledge on the part of private sector/fisher champions on bycatch reduction devises.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	---------------------------------

The TE notes that the project experienced delays and inefficiencies that reduced its cost-effectiveness. The project's lead technical officer was housed in the FAO office in Rome, while the budget holder was housed in an FAO office in Bangkok. Managing the projects from two sites made implementation complex and led to administrative delays. However, the TE notes that some choices made by project management may have led to greater efficiency, including the use of local/regional consultants. The TE also assesses project costs to be commensurate with the progress made in building capacities in the region and with the improvements in bycatch/fisheries management.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Likely
---------------------------	----------------

The TE found that the project had "left in place an effective institutional framework for achieving and sustaining its long-term impacts (exit strategy)". Financial sustainability is likely because at project

completion several countries had allocated funds from national budgets for sustaining project activities, and some of the elements of the projects were already being replicated.

Financial sustainability: The project did not make provisions for funds to support activities in the post-completion period, however by the end of the project some of the project countries had already allocated funds from the national budgets for implementation, enforcement, and other activities, while in the others stakeholders said that the countries could support continuing work on their fishery management plans and implementation. There are good prospects for financial support from other donors and initiatives, for example the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization's project in Papua New Guinea, and the GEF World Bank's Coastal Resources for Sustainable Development project in Viet Nam. Financially, some of the benefits of the project are also self-sustaining. The TE provides this example: "trawl fishers who have installed juvenile and trash-fish excluder devices on their vessels have reported an increase in catch per unit of effort and in the quality and value of their catches" (TE p.104)

Sociopolitical sustainability: The TE team noted a considerable level of stakeholder buy-in and ownership of the project, both at a political level and among private sector stakeholders. However, the TE notes that the low commitment of the private fishing sector to sustainable development, reflected in poor compliance with fisheries regulations, is a risk factor, and that more work is needed in this area.

Institutional sustainability: The TE notes strengthening of the national/provincial and regional institutional frameworks for trawl fisheries management as one of the project's most notable achievements, which provided an essential foundation and mechanism for sustaining the project's outcomes and achieving long-term impacts. The project engaged the government agencies responsible for fisheries in the five countries as key partners, along with private sector and NGO stakeholders. The establishment of public and private sector partnerships by the project, including the Samar Sea TWG, the Samar Sea Alliance of local government units, the Provincial Fisheries Committee in Trat, and the working group for the development and implementation of Kien Giang trawl fisheries management plan, also provide institutional support for continuation of project benefits. Finally, in some project countries the development of national policies and fisheries management plans occurred during project implementation. In the Philippines the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources mainstreamed the Samar Sea Fisheries Management Plan in its programs, and issued an ordinance institutionalizing an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries management for management of countries fisheries.

Environmental sustainability: There are no environmental threats to sustainability.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

There was a shortfall in materialized co-financing, as expected co-financing was roughly 8 million USD, while materialized co-financing was roughly 6 million USD. Materialized co-financing was provided by

participating governments, private sector stakeholders in county, FAO, the Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, WWF, and Sustainable Fisheries partnerships and Marine Ingredients Organization. Co-financing expected from the German Society for International Cooperation was planned to contribute to costs for the project regional coordinator, and this shortfall meant that the project regional coordinator was assigned as part-time, which may have led to some challenges in project implementation.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project startup was delayed, with the original intended start date of November 1st, 2011, pushed back to April 1st, 2012. Two no-cost extensions were granted, extending the project length from an originally intended four years to five years.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE found that country ownership during the project was good, both among public and private sector stakeholders, and supported achievement of project results. The project was executed by the relevant public institutions, and the national working groups were also found to be effective, and to have aided in country ownership.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
The project M&E design includes a separate budget for M&E, arrangements for a mid-term and final project evaluation. Responsible parties for M&E data collection and reporting are also identified. Indicators for tracking progress are relevant but are not easily measured or quantified, they tend to track outputs rather than outcomes. M&E Design is rated as moderately satisfactory	
6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
Project M&E was conducted through the progress reports conducted every six months, as well as annual implementation reports and annual reports to the project steering committee. The TE notes that the project did not report against indicators specified in the M&E design, and did not have a functioning	

M&E system in place to enable project partners to track progress. The project's mid-term evaluation was considered useful by stakeholders and its recommendations were used in the project's second half. Because performance was not tracked on specified indicators, M&E implementation is rated as moderately unsatisfactory.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
--	-----------------------------------

FAO was the project implementing agency. Some issues with the project management arrangements are noted in the TE. For example, as noted in the section on project efficiency, the project's lead technical officer was housed in the FAO office in Rome, while the budget holder was housed in an FAO office in Bangkok. This complicated situation led to administrative delays. An additional shortcoming was when co-financing from the German Development Bank failed to materialize, rather than reducing the project design accordingly, the shortfall was handled by assigning the project regional coordinator as part time only, which led to delays and shortcomings in coordination between countries. Though this can be considered a use of adaptive management, on the part of FAO, likely a project design revision was needed, as the terminal evaluation reports that the PRC was "insufficiently able to manage the project." (TE p.43) The projects also experienced delays due to the need for translation of Letters of Agreement, and the TE reports that stakeholders in country felt they were poorly explained at project start. The TE notes that given the different languages in the five implementation countries, a dedicated translation budget was necessary.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: UA
---	------------

The project was executed by the relevant ministry in each project country, along with the Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC.) Quality of execution at a country level is not provided in the TER or other project implementation reports. The TE notes that the capacity strengthening of SEAFDEC to coordinate large scale projects was an unanticipated outcome of the project. As limited information is available, quality of project execution is rated as UA.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE notes that, “Although it is too early to attribute clear environmental impacts to the project, implementation and enforcement of the bycatch management plans, along with addressing fishing over-capacity, should result in substantial and sustained environmental benefits in the longer term (provided that the ecosystems are resilient to external factors such as climate change and marine pollution).” (TE p.8)

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project contributed to improved data through the socio-economic studies that were conducted, providing a valuable baseline and raising awareness about the importance of these issues in trawl fisheries management. Increasing livelihoods as an objective in all three plans and adoption of EAFM by the countries will help to promote gender considerations in the management of trawl fisheries. (TE p.8)

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The project provided training on a variety of topics. In order to strengthen capacity for data collection and mapping, the project held national training workshops on data collection protocols and methodologies, including training on conducting socio-economic surveys and gender mainstreaming. (TE

p.103) A project website was set up to share information, however language barriers may have reduced the usefulness of the project website, which was in English. Project information, education, and communication material was produced, and all project countries planned to publish some of the national project reports. Training was also provided on the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) and co-management (TE p.40)

b) Governance

In the Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam, previously existing fisheries management plans had not explicitly covered management of bycatch. The project was a catalyst in getting these three countries to develop fisheries management plans that covered trawl fisheries and integrated EAFM principles. In Viet Nam, the government froze the number of trawlers operating in Vietnamese waters in November 2015 and established a port sampling system to cover trawl fisheries throughout the country. In the Samar region and in Thailand, specific regulations were developed for bycatch management (e.g. increase in trawl mesh sizes, closed areas and closed season). Countries also dedicated their own financial resources for certain related activities, which is another impact of increasing knowledge and awareness. (TE p.103)

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE notes that the capacity strengthening of Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) to coordinate large scale projects was an unanticipated outcome of the project. (TE p.7)

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

Some replication of specific elements of the project were taking place by project end. Examples of replication and mainstreaming noted in the terminal evaluation are included below:

“in the Philippines, the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources endorsed EAFM as a nationwide strategy and training in EAFM and alternative livelihoods was being extended to other municipalities. In fact, the Samar Sea pilot site had become a model for trawl fisheries management and EAFM, and had also been used in a video on EAFM. This video was being used by FAO and others to promote EAFM. Project results from the Gulf of Thailand had been shared with the provinces on the Andaman coast in Thailand and new regulations were applicable to all

fish trawlers in Thailand. In Viet Nam, neighboring provinces to Kien Giang had adopted EAFM planning frameworks for coastal resources management.” (TE p.103)

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The key lessons noted in the terminal evaluation are included below: (TE p. 44)

- The Lead Technical Officer not being located in the region and in the same office as the budget holder, along with the heavy workload of both the Lead Technical Officer and budget holder during the project, created challenges and contributed to delays that impacted negatively on project implementation, even though FAO displayed some adaptive management in the implementation arrangements to provide as much support to the project as possible;
- Shortfalls in expected co-financing may require reduction in project activities, rather than a stretching of project management resources. The decision was made to proceed with the project even once it was clear that Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit co-financing would not be available for a fulltime Project Regional Coordinators. As a result, a part-time Project Regional Coordinator had to be hired, which was insufficient for effective management of the project and also contributed to unrealistic demands on the Lead Technical Officer, both of which impacted on implementation;
- When projects are implemented in multiple countries with different language needs, a dedicated translation budget is necessary. The lack of a dedicated editing and translation budget resulted in the Project Regional Coordinator and Lead Technical Officer spending undue amounts of time translating and editing documents in English. For example, Letter of Agreement needed to be translated into local languages so that participating countries could fully understand their contents and implications. This created project implementation delays;
- The Project Regional Coordinator being a consultant to FAO rather than a full-time staff member, reduced his ability to provide clearance of project outputs specified in Letters of Agreement with participating countries. This increased the burden on the Lead Technical Officer and resulted in delays in technical clearances, financial payments to countries, and other administrative delays, and therefore in implementation;
- Over-reliance on verbal (rather than written) guidance to participating countries, the lack of a project implementation manual, and limited time spent by the PRC and other key project staff on the ground in some of the countries (particularly Papua New Guinea) impacted negatively on implementation. A more informative inception period for project partners and more time spent in the countries by project personnel would have been beneficial in supporting subsequent implementation;
- The Project Steering Committee was comprised of appropriate representation and provided

guidance to the project that was generally useful. However in some instances representatives delegating their participation in meetings to National Project Coordinators reduced the potential policy impact of the project and the oversight controls one would expect of a Project Steering Committee;

- National Project Coordinators were staff of, and housed within, executing institutions in the five project countries, which meant that they had regular line duties to complete in addition to the project-specific activities that were required of them. However, the challenges of combining routine functions with the requirements of the project were outweighed by the benefits that resulted from the integration of the project into the government executing institutions;
- Country ownership and stakeholder participation (which were both good) were crucial for achievement of project objectives at the national level and sustaining project impacts;
- While routine monitoring of project progress was good, the project did not revise the logframe based on the MTE recommendations;
- The delays and inefficiencies experienced during the project implementation likely reduced cost effectiveness. However, the results-based approach to implementation may have increased efficiency: local/regional consultants were used where necessary, representing good value for money; NPCs were generally not paid which saved costs; and the total project costs were not considered excessive when considering the achievements in building capacities in the region and progress towards improved bycatch/fisheries management measures.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The terminal evaluation's recommendations are as follows: (TE p.9)

- **Recommendation 1.** To FAO and the project management (Lead Technical Officer, budget holder, Regional Facilitation Unit): Disseminate project information and support sustainability and replication. The evaluation team recommends that the project implement the following actions, and complete those already initiated, in the remaining time frame of the project: i) provision of a full-time contract for the Field Administrative Officer to provide inputs to support the project; ii) generate missing data for a number of indicators; iii) finalize estimates of co-financing; iv) finalize and publish a number of outstanding project technical reports; v) update the project website with all relevant project-related material; vi) Prepare short policy briefs for each country on key project objectives and activities, key achievements and key lessons learned about successes; vii) prepare an exit strategy to cover both the sustainability of project activities and replication/scaling up; and viii) finalize the component budget revision to reflect actual expenditures
- **Recommendation 2.** To the FAO project team and relevant project partners to ensure the sustainability of project results: Given the good momentum towards the end of the project and the groundwork that has been laid, the evaluation team recommends considering a follow-up

activity that provides additional support for the improved governance and management of trawl fisheries in the region. In doing so, project partners and potential funders should move quickly to agree on such a future action, in order to minimize the gap between the cessation of the current project and a follow-up activity.

- **Recommendation 3.** To the GEF Coordination Unit of FAO and FAO technical divisions, including the budget holder, to improve future GEF or donor-funded projects: Ensure a rigorous formulation and implementation process that takes into account the lessons learned drawn from this and other GEF project evaluations.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE provides a thorough assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project, as well as achievement of objectives.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent, and well written. Substantiation of ratings cannot be assessed.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	A thorough explanation of sustainability and project exit strategy is provided.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are complete and supported by the evidence.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Project costs as well as materialized co-financing information is provided.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE provides a thorough assessment of M&E implementation but no discussion of M&E design.	MS
Overall TE Rating		S

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).